



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------	------------------

10/804,081

03/19/2004

Sakari Kotola

4208-4047US1

7038

27123

7590

03/26/2009

MORGAN & FINNEGAN Transition Team
C/O Locke Lord Bissell & Liddell
3 WORLD FINANCIAL CENTER
NEW YORK, NY 10281-2101

EXAMINER

YUN, EUGENE

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

2618

NOTIFICATION DATE

DELIVERY MODE

03/26/2009

ELECTRONIC

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

Shopkins@Lockelord.com
OWalker@Lockelord.com

Office Action Summary	Application No. 10/804,081	Applicant(s) KOTOLA ET AL.	
	Examiner EUGENE YUN	Art Unit 2618	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 06 January 2009.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-8, 16-19 and 52-77 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) 52-55 is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☒ Claim(s) 1-8, 16-19 and 72-77 is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 56-71 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

1. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

2. Claims 56-71 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Philipsson (US 2001/0007815) and Labun et al. (US 6,842,621) and further in view of Fox et al. (US 5,943,624).

Referring to Claim 56, Philipsson teaches a method, comprising:

detecting a RF-ID interrogation signal in an RF-ID communications module (see lines 3-4 of paragraph [0007]);

Philipsson does not teach instructing a wireless short-range communication module to enter into a page scanning mode for detecting paging signals addressed to said wireless short-range communication module. Labun teaches instructing a wireless short-range communication module to enter into a page scanning mode for detecting paging signals addressed to said wireless short-range communication module (see col. 9, lines 30-34). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to provide the teachings of Labun to said device of Philipsson in order for a user to be better informed of the status of a wireless communication terminal.

The combination of Philipsson and Labun does not teach receiving a notification signal indicating presence of an RF-ID interrogation signal from an associated RF-ID communication module in response to detecting an interrogation signal by said RF-ID communications module. Fox teaches receiving a notification signal indicating presence of an RF-ID interrogation signal from an associated RF-ID communication module in response to detecting an interrogation signal by said RF-ID communications module (see col. 3, lines 16-22). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to provide the teachings of Fox to the modified device of Philipsson and Labun in order to reduce signal degradation between short range RF-ID devices.

Referring to Claim 62, Philipsson teaches an apparatus comprising:

a processor 21 (fig. 2);

a wireless short-range communication module (see lines 5-6 of paragraph [0019]); and

a near field communication module configured to detect a RF-ID interrogation signal (see lines 3-4 of paragraph [0007]) and send a response signal including identification information relating to the wireless short-range communication module (see paragraphs [0020] and the last 3 lines of [0022]).

Philipsson does not teach the processor configured to instruct the wireless short range-communication module to enter into a page scanning mode for detecting paging signals addressed to the wireless short-range communication module. Labun teaches the processor configured to instruct the wireless short range-communication module to

Art Unit: 2618

enter into a page scanning mode for detecting paging signals addressed to the wireless short-range communication module (see col. 9, lines 30-34). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to provide the teachings of Labun to said device of Philipsson in order for a user to be better informed of the status of a wireless communication terminal.

The combination of Philipsson and Labun does not teach receiving a notification signal indicating presence of an RF-ID interrogation signal from the near field communication module. Fox teaches receiving a notification signal indicating presence of an RF-ID interrogation signal from the near field communication module (see col. 3, lines 16-22). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to provide the teachings of Fox to the modified device of Philipsson and Labun in order to reduce signal degradation between short range RF-ID devices.

Claim 68 has similar limitations as claim 56.

Referring to Claims 57 and 63, Philipsson also teaches including in the RF-ID response signal at least a unique Bluetooth identification number of the wireless short-range communication module (see paragraph [0016]).

Referring to Claims 58 and 64, Philipsson also teaches including in the RF-ID response signal a Bluetooth serial number and Bluetooth Clock Offset information of the wireless short-range communication module (see paragraph [0016]).

Referring to Claims 59, 65, and 69, Labun also teaches entering into a Bluetooth page scan mode after detecting the interrogation signal (see col. 9, lines 30-34).

Referring to Claims 60, 66, and 70, Philipsson also teaches receiving a paging signal as an initial signal to activate the wireless short-range communication module (see paragraph [0022]).

Referring to Claims 61, 67, and 71, Philipsson also teaches skipping an inquiry stage (paragraph [0020]) and initiating a shortened set up upon receiving a paging signal (see paragraph [0025]).

Allowable Subject Matter

3. Claims 1-8, 16-19, and 72-77 are allowed.

Regarding Claim 1, Philipsson and Labun do not teach, alone nor in combination, the combination of:

Using a notification for setting a short-range communication module in the second terminal into a page scanning mode for detecting paging signals directed to the second terminal;

responding to an RF-ID interrogation signal by transmitting a RF-ID response signal to the first terminal including identification information relating to the short-range communication module of the second terminal;

processing the received RF-ID response signal by the first terminal to activate a short-range communication module in the first terminal to initiate a shortened session setup by skipping the inquiry mode; transmitting a short-range paging signal directed to the second terminal based on information of the received RF-ID response signal and

Art Unit: 2618

entering a page mode to establish a short-range connection with the second terminal;
and

detecting the paging signal by the short range communication module in the second terminal for immediate establishment of a short range connection between the first and second terminals by skipping the inquiry mode.

Claim 75 is allowable for similar reasons as claim 1.

Response to Arguments

4. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 56-71 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Conclusion

5. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of

Art Unit: 2618

the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to EUGENE YUN whose telephone number is (571)272-7860. The examiner can normally be reached on 9:00am-6:00pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Duc Nguyen can be reached on (571)272-7503. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

Eugene Yun
Primary Examiner
Art Unit 2618

/Eugene Yun/
Primary Examiner, Art Unit 2618
/E. Y./

Application/Control Number: 10/804,081

Page 8

Art Unit: 2618

Primary Examiner, Art Unit 2618